



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE COMPANIES—NEGLIGENCE—LIABILITY FOR FAILURE OF SERVICE.—SOUTHWESTERN TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE COMPANY V. THOMAS, 185 S. W. (Tex.) 396.—Plaintiff was unable to cope with a fire which had started in his residence. As a result of the central telephone operator being asleep while on duty, he was unable to call the fire department until fifteen minutes had passed. Due to this delay, the fire had reached the upper part of the house at the arrival of the fire department, and was beyond its control, as the water pressure was insufficient to throw the water to that height. *Held*, plaintiff could not recover on the ground that the negligence of the defendant was not shown to have been the proximate cause of the loss.

In case of failure to provide prompt and efficient service, telephone and telegraph companies are responsible for losses which are the proximate result. *Vinsone v. So. Bell Tel. & Tel. Co.*, 188 Ala. 292; *Veitch v. W. U. Tel. Co.*, 59 So. (Ala.) 352. The loss must be such as persons of ordinary care and forethought could have contemplated as a consequence of the breach. *Chicago v. Starr*, 42 Ill. 174. Thus, the delay was not the proximate cause of the death of a horse, where a telephone company negligently failed to deliver a message for a veterinary. *Centr. U. Tel. Co. v. Swoveland*, 42 N. E. (Ind.) 1035. Similarly, where a company failed to deliver a message to a witness, who, plaintiff claimed, would have turned a suit in his favor. *Martin v. Tel. & Tel. Co.*, 18 Wash. 260; and where a torn up street prevented a fire engine reaching a fire, it was held such negligence was not a proximate cause. *Hazel v. Owensboro*, 30 Ky. L. R. 627. The decision in the principal case, holding that the spreading of a fire can hardly be called a proximate result of a delay in making telephone connections, is in accord with the present weight of authority, but it offers a practical opportunity for the extension of this doctrine.

S. J. T.